UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes Francis Neilson

The Riddle of Amnesty

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

Unity and Effectiveness in Religion

By OSCAR B. HAWES

Shelley

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

VOLUME LXXXVII NUMBER 20

Chicago, July 21, 1921

PUBLISHED BI-WEEKLY

UNITY

$3.00 PER ANNUM.

ESTABLISHED 1878

With THE FREE RELIGIOUS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, THE CONGRESS OF RELIGIONS, and all other organizations and individuals seeking to widen fellowship and to realize the Brotherhood of the Spirit unrimmed by creed, form or sectarian prejudices

EDITORS
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FRANCIS NEILSON

ASSISTANT EDITOR
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTORS

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
Frank C. Doan
Charles F. Dole
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
George Grover Mills
Susan M. Quackenbush
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
Albert R. Vail
Arthur L. Weatherly
James H. West

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, CHICAGO, ILL.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

Sample Copies of UNITY Sent Upon Request

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Contents:

EDITORIAL—

Notes.—J. H. H. 307
The Riddle of Amnesty.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 309

THE PULPIT—

Unity and Effectiveness in Religion.—REV. OSCAR B. HAWES 310

CONTRIBUTED—

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature. VIII. Shelley.—GEORGE WILLIS COOKE 313
The Fire Fighters.—HENRY W. PINKHAM 315

SELECTED—

The Political Function of Religion.—*Vivian T. Pomeroy*. 316

POETRY—

The Negro Speaks of Rivers.—*Langston Hughes* 307
Three Wise Men of the East.—*Frederick Peterson* 310
Debs the Dreamer.—*Ellis B. Harris* 312
Indian-Pipe.—*Florence Earle Coates* 315

THE FIELD—

Proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States 319
The World Peace and American-Japanese Co-operation.—*Lucia Ames Mead* 319

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVII THURSDAY, JULY 21, 1921 NUMBER 20

THE NEGRO SPEAKS OF RIVERS.

I've known rivers:
I've known rivers ancient as the world and older than the flow of human blood in human veins.

My soul has grown deep like the rivers.

I bathed in the Euphrates when dawns were young.
I built my hut near the Congo and it lulled me to sleep.
I looked upon the Nile and raised the pyramids above it.
I heard the singing of the Mississippi when Abe Lincoln went down to New Orleans, and I've seen its muddy bosom turn all golden in the sunset.

I've known rivers;
Ancient, dusky rivers.

My soul has grown deep like the rivers.

The Crisis. —*Langston Hughes.*

The elevation to the Supreme Court of William Howard Taft by appointment of Warren Gamaliel Harding, is perfection. Chief Justice Taft fits President Harding like a glove. The balance between the White House at one end of Pennsylvania Avenue and the Supreme Court chamber at the other, is now exact. As time goes on, and one thing after another happens, we are persuaded that, just as Monroe's administration is known in history as "the era of good feeling," so Harding's administration is destined to be known as the era of amiable mediocrity!

Every sign seems to indicate that America is in the midst of the darkest period of reaction that the present generation has ever known. The conservative forces of the country are everywhere occupying the seats of power, with nothing serious to disturb their equanimity. The liberal and radical groups, on the contrary, seem to have reached the nadir of weakness and despair. The progressives in both the old parties, with the exception of a few lonely figures like La Follette, have become wholly absorbed into their respective political organizations. The Farmer-Labor party has disappeared; and the Committee of Forty-Eight is attempting nothing more than to maintain a skeleton organization in hopes of better days. The Non-Partisan League has plainly fallen on evil times; the Socialists are at their lowest ebb of power; and the Communists are spending all their strength in bitter factional fights. The American Federation of Labor has been hopeless for years, and is now more hopeless than ever before, as witness its recent convention. Strikes have been successfully broken on every hand, unions disrupted, the "open shop" established far and wide. The only bright spots on the horizon are the triumph of the Amalgamated Textile Workers in their prolonged and heroic strike during this past winter, a matchless testimonial to the consummate statesmanship of Sidney Hillman; and the growing sentiment for disarmament. This is "our winter of discontent"; when will it be "made glorious summer"? No man can tell! For the present, darkness shrouds the landscape of our hope, and there is little we can do but watch and wait, and hold fast to the faith!

So inadequate and inaccurate is the foreign news service of our daily press, that we hesitate to make comment on any such complicated event as the recent close of the British coal strike. In labor, as in Irish affairs, we have long since learned that the true story seldom gets across the Atlantic, either because the American newspapers will not receive it, or because the English authorities will not let it pass. It is this very fact, however, which persuades us to believe, subject to correction from well-informed sources, that the miners of Great Britain, in their long struggle against tremendous odds both inside and outside their ranks have won a great victory. How otherwise explain the unescapable impression to this effect which is written all over the exceedingly meagre despatches which have told us in this country of the terms of the settlement. It is hard enough to make out what has happened; but we know at least that the miners have gone back to work not without recompenses and guarantees; and the chances are that they have taken with them a good deal more. If this is the outcome of a fight fought single-handed at an unfavorable time and with a depleted exchequer, what would have been the outcome had the Triple Alliance joined in the battle?

The situation in Transylvania, which was transferred to the control of the Roumanian government by the Treaty of Versailles, seems to be getting worse rather than better. Religious persecution seems to be a particularly terrible factor, according to reports received by the American Committee on the Rights of Religious Minorities. The Roumanian government is either finding it impossible to protect the Transylvanians, or else is deliberately permitting or encouraging a condition of out-and-out repression. All Saxon and Hungarian communities in this unhappy country are being subjected to constant outrage by the clergy and officials of the Roumanian State Church, which of course is Greek Orthodox in character, and by the Roumanian soldiers. The personal and official liberty

of the officers of the native churches is hampered in a hundred and one ways, and in some cases is entirely taken away. Many members of these churches have been imprisoned, and many others driven into exile. The private property of these people has been ruthlessly commandeered, and the property of their schools and colleges, and in some cases of their churches, has been either seized or destroyed. We doubt if the history of modern times, outside of the experience of the Jews and Armenians, shows a worse instance of religious persecution than this which is now being suffered by the people of Transylvania. And it all is the result of a great victory in a war fought to make the world safe for democracy! We killed millions of men and spent unnumbered millions of dollars, in other words, to overthrow one tyranny, that of Austria, only to erect another and more fearful tyranny, that of Roumania, in its place. The Roumanians were our allies and therefore had to be satisfied at the peace table in Paris. As a consequence these unhappy Hungarians of Transylvania, who are so closely akin to us in every intellectual and spiritual sense, were deliberately surrendered to the tender mercies of these Slavic barbarians. We often wonder what our English and American Unitarians think of the war which they supported so lustily, when they look upon the plight of their Transylvanian co-religionists.

We find ourselves tempted to sympathize with the recent statement of Prof. Charles Richet, President of the French National Peace Society, "I am, needless to say, the most inoffensive creature in the world. But I often think with anguish that if a dozen individuals in Europe had been killed, the war would never have taken place." This reminds us of the statement made by Dr. Frederic Lynch at the outbreak of the war, that less than two score men in Europe were responsible for what had taken place. This view of things, of course, is true to the extent that certain men are responsible for decisions of war and peace. Some president or premier decides in the particular crisis that a nation shall fight, and some military leader gives the command that an army shall march. Nevertheless, we feel at bottom that such diagnosis of responsibility for so terrific an event as the Great War, is superficial. To have taken a dozen individuals from the seats of power in July, 1914, and shot them, in order that they might not launch a war upon the world, would hardly have solved the problem in which humanity was involved at that awful moment. If the dozen individuals to whom Prof. Richet refers had not held the balances, another dozen would have; if the war had not broken at one time, it would have broken at another; if the shooting of the Grand Duke had not been the spark that kindled the conflagration, some other flame would have done the business. The Great War, in other words, was a social cataclysm precipitated by deeplying social causes. The idea of men, even emperors, controlling such a phenomenon, is like the idea of beasts of the field controlling an earthquake. To say this is not to evade or deny the issue of personal responsibility for what takes place in the world. But the question of responsibility in the case of the Great War concerns not the decisions that were made in the awful crisis of 1914, but the decisions that were *not* made, in the many years preceding that crisis, to the end of the elimination of the forces everywhere at work for the making of war among the nations of the earth. And this, may we say, is a distributed responsibility! At this moment, for example, we are all of us responsible if disarmament is not speedily undertaken by America!

The "Blue Book" tone that attached itself to the Dempsey-Carpentier fight is not difficult to appraise. Hitherto a pugilistic encounter of this kind has been supposed to attract the interest of the sporting world, and bring to the ring-side the thousands of roughnecks, hoodlums, gamblers and "good sports" who are not conspicuous under ordinary conditions. But this last prize-fight was a society event. It was attended by social leaders, financial magnates, business men, statesmen, authors, and more than five thousand women of character and standing. It was featured for weeks in the news-columns of our highest-class newspapers. It was the single topic of conversation in clubs, colleges, professional offices, as well as in the saloon and the gutter. Does all this mean that prize-fighting has suddenly been lifted up into respectability? Not at all!—it simply means that our social life has suddenly been lowered down into vulgarity and brutishness. The four years' orgy of the Great War gave release and blessing to those innate and suppressed passions of the beast which are in us all. What before we were ashamed of, would not admit to ourselves, and used the social sanction to beat down and hide away within us, we now bring to the surface and happily indulge. We glory in our lust for blood, in all those things which mark our kinship to "the ape and tiger." It is this which the Great War has done for us. Not civilization but brute barbarism is now respectable. Hence the sudden acceptance of pugilism by the *elite!*

New devices for persuading or coercing people to go to church, are of almost daily occurrence. The latest comes from Aurora, Nebraska, where there is a church which has decided to "keep tabs" upon its members. In order to put them on record, it has decreed that each member on arriving at the church door, shall present a card which shall be punched, like a monthly ticket on the railroad, in a column showing the date of attendance and the character of

the meeting attended. At the end of stated periods, all the cards are to be collected and tabulated. Then any member who has fallen below a fixed standard, will be summoned before the official board of the church, and by some means not yet announced, be made to change his ways. This plan looks systematic and business-like, and therefore up to date. It represents undoubtedly a sincere endeavor to separate the sheep from the goats. But as a device for getting people into church, it looks exceedingly dubious to us. Indeed, we are inclined to believe that this Nebraska church is destined to have the smallest, even though the most regular attendance, that it his had in years. If so, the experience may be well worth while. For the church may learn therefrom that it is not card-systems but religion that fills the pews—and religion, be it said, that is something more than creeds, rituals and denominationalism!

The Riddle of Amnesty

There are persistent rumors that Mr. Debs is soon to be pardoned. Before these words are printed, this great and true American may be released from his long confinement in the Atlanta penitentiary. Nothing that is done, however, by the authorities at this late hour can alter or abate the hideous injustice of the treatment that has been meted out to him, or answer the curious riddle that seems to be involved in this whole problem of amnesty for political offenders. Even if Mr. Debs is granted his freedom, hundreds of other men convicted under national or state sedition laws, will remain indefinitely behind the bars; and there will be at large that amazing class of Germans and pro-Germans who have ever found it so easy to win pardon from the government!

It is this latter fact—mercy for spies and criminals of the most shameless character, and mercilessness for men guilty only of the offense of minority opinion—which constitutes what we call "the riddle of amnesty." Why is pardon so easy in those cases where it seems least deserved, and so difficult in those cases where it seems most fitting?

The case of Herr von Rintelen, which caused so much discussion in President Wilson's administration, is an illustration of what we mean. Here is a man who was a German, sent to this country as a spy to interefere with war operations. He was arrested and convicted for what would seem to be the somewhat serious offense of planting explosive bombs on ocean steamships. Had he succeeded in his work, we would have had not one Lusitania horror, but many. And yet this man, after serving only a portion of a sentence, not as long as that imposed upon 'Gene Debs, was pardoned by Mr. Wilson, or at least his sentence commuted, on the single condition that he return at once to his native land.

Another case of much the same kind, is just now disgracing the Harding administration. This concerns a certain Franz J. Feinler, a former chaplain in the United States Army. Feinler was a pro-German. Although wearing the uniform, he sympathized with Germany to such an extent that he was sent back from over-seas for treasonable utterances and propaganda among our soldiers in favor of Germany. Untaught by or contemptuous of this warning, he continued to talk loud and often, among other things defending the sinking of the Lusitania and the shooting of Nurse Cavel. At last he began to urge the men in his charge to refuse to fight Germany. This broke the inexplicable patience of the army authorities. Feinler was tried by court martial, sentenced to fifteen years' imprisonment, and the sentence was confirmed by the reviewing authority. After serving three years, he was liberated on parole; and now, by President Harding, on recommendation of Secretary Weeks, he has been pardoned.

"Why?" asks the New York *Times*. We are among those who would like to know the answer to this question. Secretary Weeks recommended the pardon on the ground that Chaplain Feinler had been punished enough. This may be true—it is difficult to call in question such high authority as Mr. Weeks! But if so, why does not the same principle of mercy, or justice, apply to Mr. Debs and hundreds of other political offenders for whom it has been to date impossible to win favor? Compare Feinler with Debs! Both were accounted guilty of words—of saying things calculated to interfere with the great war effort of the country. But Feinler was a soldier, while Debs was a civilian. Feinler spoke his words inside the United States army, and Debs among men in the ordinary walks of life. Feinler deliberately tried to dissuade men in uniform from fighting against Germany, while Debs was charged only with making general statements to a public audience, the effect of which *indirectly might have been* to dissuade men from taking up arms. Feinler sympathized with Germany, as Debs never did, and defended acts of war on the part of the Germans which Debs always denounced. Every element of this comparison is in favor of the Socialist leader and not of the army chaplain. And yet it is the latter and not the former, who is pardoned!

That such policy on the part of the government constitutes a "riddle," would seem to go without saying. Who has an answer to this riddle? We have one which we are loath to accept, but which seems to be the only one which fits. Such men as von Rintelen and Feinler are guilty of infinitely more serious offenses than any even alleged to have been committed by Debs or any of his comrades. But the former are released from prison and the latter confined! This assuredly means that there is something

about such men as von Rintelen and Feinler which wins the favor of the government, and something about such men as Debs and the Socialists and the I. W. W.s and the rest, which wins the disfavor of the government. And what can this be but the one thing in which, so far as the record is concerned, the men differ from one another—namely, *their political opinions in time of peace.* Feinler, apart from his pro-German proclivities which are only serious when we are engaged in a war against Germany, is a perfectly safe and sane conservative. He believes in capitalism, the established order, the flag, and the Grand Old Party. Debs, however, fails to qualify in these matters. He is opposed to capitalism, believes in the revolution, hails the red flag, and is a Socialist. This means that Debs is as dangerous to-day as he ever was. Therefore, unlike Feinler, he has not been punished long enough. Nay, he cannot be, for no punishment short of hell is long enough for a man guilty of such a crime as questioning the infallibility of capitalistic dogma and the perfection of the existing social order.

Let us, therefore, have the conclusion of the whole matter. The political offenders arrested during the war, were imprisoned not because of any actual crimes of sedition against the government, but because they were radicals or "reds." They are being held in prison at this moment for the same reason.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

THREE WISE MEN OF THE EAST.

I.

One Seer from out the Bo Tree's mystic shade
Saw visions of the world that is to be—
The self forgot and thus from prison made free
Man facing fate serene and undismayed;

Freed from the blight of wealth and power and fame
He turns to truth and service to mankind,
Right thought, right striving, and a mindful mind
To reach Right Rapture his diviner aim.

II.

A wise Old Man through blossoms of the peach
Beside the Yellow River saw the Way
In the spring splendor to a better day—
The Way to live, the Way that he must teach:

Be simple in your every want, be just,
Free of desire, compassionate, and mild;
Be gentle, humble as a little child;
Do good for evil, be obscure as dust.

III.

And One saw from the shadow of the Cross
Peace in the world, a common brotherhood,
Each seeking lovingly the other's good
Finding his life through losing all its dross;

One Father smiling on the faults forgiven
As all come arm in arm and happily
Like little children to a father's knee—
The earth at last become the Kingdom of Heaven.

Nation (New York). —*Frederick Peterson.*

THE PULPIT

Unity and Effectiveness in Religion

Sermon by Rev. Oscar B. Hawes in All Souls Church, Summit, N. J.

TEXT: *"Now there are diversities of gifts but the same spirit."—I Corinthians* 12:4.

For centuries there has been a vision of a spiritual ideal before mankind, which, long since should have been realized. That ideal has been the unity of mankind in the purpose of establishing righteousness, justice, truth, good-will on earth.

Such was the ideal of Jesus. He called it the Kingdom of God and ever since His followers have been spoken of as "one army strong" "one in hope and duty, one in charity."

The church, that is, organized religion, should be "a great brotherhood of believers and workers aflame with the passion of their great leader." The church should be the organ of the divine, and as such the universal, will and purpose.

Whenever and wherever the spirit of Jesus has been deeply felt, this ideal has, in part, at least, been realized. Religion has then become effective. If men were united in the purpose of establishing righteousness and justice, if they really felt a common relationship and had a sense of sharing in a common life, then in this unity of the religious spirit we would find a most effective power. Disputes would be settled. Poverty would cease. War would be impossible.

This ideal of unity of purpose and spirit that should be real, makes the actual that is not ideal, all the more clear. And because of this contrast, we are made to face the *indictment of current religion.*

There is a deep seated feeling at the present time that organized religion does not "measure up to the inexorable spiritual challenge of our day." The effort of Christianity seems futile before the vast problems with which the world is confronted. "In the time of the world's need, why is it," it is asked, "that religion seems to have no salvation to offer?"

The first reason is because of *lack of Unity.* There is division everywhere in religion. "A divided house cannot stand" and the religious structure is undermined by the motives which cause the division as well as weakened by the division itself.

We face everywhere what some call "the scandal of denominationalism." There is an "unconscionable number of small struggling churches," often striving each for its own interest and prosperity and generally competing one with another.

What is the reason for this division? Some say the clergy are to blame. First, because many of them do not want unity. They believe that denominations are necessary, that they have their origin in peculiar mentalities and temperaments, which cannot be ignored. Some ministers say that the competition among the churches is wholesome. Second, because some of them cannot conceive of the elimination of their own denomination. Third, because some fear to lose their own position.

Others find the cause of the division in the past, with its creeds and traditional authority. The divisions, the loyalties, the hatreds, the martyrdoms of the past still hold their hand upon us and keep many apart who otherwise might be united. It was not long ago when the belief was general that salvation de-

pended upon the precise form of one's doctrinal faith.

Another cause for the division lies in the denominational organizations.

In a new community, where at first there are no churches, instead of letting a church rise naturally from the common life of the people, all uniting in it, denominational organizations send in "organized invaders," lend money if need be, and put up denominational churches whether they are needed or not.

Then finally, the people are to blame. They get what they want. We are creatures of habit and convention. Most of us like to have our own opinions preached back to us. We dread the new and the strange. There are not many who really like "the open door" and cultivate the open mind.

"The church split up into a hundred sects cannot help humanity to choose the right road. In the face of such weakness and division, evils exist unrebuked."

Many therefore say they will have none of such religion, and turn their backs upon all the churches.

But is such action fair? Is it religion, is it the churches alone that are divided and ineffective? Is organized Christianity alone to be condemned?

In industry do we not see the same competition and division? Competition has been said to be "the life of trade" and yet it is also a matter of common realization to-day that the only principles which can really succeed in business are those of co-operation and service. Do people say they will have nothing more to do with business because there are more drug stores or shoe stores or grocers in town than are needed and instead of uniting and reducing expenses these all compete and strive for patronage by fair means and sometimes foul?

When doctors disagree the patient suffers. Yet what division there is in the general field of healing! Osteopaths, chiropractors, mental healers, Christian Scientists now compete with both the Old School and the New School, until often the patient is confused by the diversity of help offered.

The world and our country is suffering because of division in politics. We have stood by and seen a bitter struggle for party gain while the world was suffering and crying for united and disinterested action. There is partisanship, division, strife, ineffectiveness everywhere. The "virus of distrust" and the partisan spirit is manifesting itself all over the world.

Religion, as devoted to the loftiest and most sacred aims of life, may perhaps be most culpable. But religion springs out of the life of the people. It reflects the time. If people believe in competition everywhere else they are apt to believe in it in religion. If they believe in partisan politics they are apt to believe in denominational churches. In any case it is not just to blame and turn away from the churches alone, but rather frankly to face the question, IS UNITY POSSIBLE?

This is the question of the day. It is the question in politics, in industry, in the world of international relationships. It is the great question in religion. Can we unite for the common good, in our churches, in our community, in our nation, in the world? The future depends upon our answer to that question.

In a certain sense Unity is obviously impossible and undesirable. If it means uniformity, we would shun it. If it means agreement in thought and belief it is impossible. We cannot and would not have identity of taste and temperament. All the variety, all the stimulus of life would then vanish. We are individuals still and there are certain things sacred to each one of us. In regard to thought and opinion "each shall give account of himself to God." Let each man be fully assured in his own mind and "happy is he that judgeth not himself by that which he approveth." It takes all sorts and conditions of men to make up a world.

But there is a real organic unity possible in the midst of diversity and in a very practical sense ONE CAN STILL BE MADE OUT OF MANY.

We do not want unity of opinion, but we do want the unity of the spirit of truth seeking. Ultimately, truth is one, justice is one, love is one. These are the very heart and essence both of life and religion. It is hopeless to get men to agree as to what form of government, what system of industry is best, but we can agree on the principle of SERVICE and that the final object of all effort should be the common good.

This spirit of truth seeking, of service, co-operation, devotion to the ideal ends of life; this sense of common relationships is the very essence of religion. It is the great unifying power. It is the expression of what is in every human being. It leads us from the individual to the universal.

How then in our world of to-day can this unity in religion be attained in practical organization?

Some say it can be attained in the COMMUNITY CHURCH.

It is a great thing, if in any community, the spirit of co-operation and good will can prevail so that out of the heart and life of the people, the common church grows into being. It would be a great thing if our democratic freedom could find expression in such a church, serving and cherishing the common welfare just as the spirit of feudalism and the middle ages found expression in the great cathedrals.

In some places this ideal is already being realized with splendid success. Differences of creed and opinion are being put aside and people are uniting upon the basis of the more fundamental things of the spirit.

But in older communities, where denominational churches are already established, the problem of religious unity is more difficult and can hardly be solved in that way, not, at least, until a great change has taken place.

For a small group of people to get together and say they are the "Community Church," when the greater part of the community is not interested, is simply to state something which obviously is not true. To call such a group "The Community Church" is a misnomer. It might be called "the Unsectarian Church" or "The Free Church." But it is not a community church unless the community is really represented in it. That is to consider the ideal as realized, when its realization has but began.

There are others therefore who say that the way to attain Unity is for every religious body to throw off its limitations, do away with its Shibboleths, cultivate a spirit of fellowship, co-operation and good will, uniting with others in service of the common welfare.

But here is where the difficulty arises. Many do not care to face the issue. Some still feel that definite doctrinal teaching must be insisted upon. Others say that the creeds and catachisms are only forms, relics of the past, retained by the power of the conservative element in the conferences and ruling bodies. They cannot be discarded at once: but they can be

accepted "with reservations": they can be disregarded as unessential. But in this case the evil remains and the confusion is only worse confounded.

Many say, with much truth, "our church is liberal. You do not have to believe all the doctrines or take the creeds literally." And yet the official statements remain as the expression of faith, and the pulpits of orthodox churches are not open to Unitarians (with few exceptions), although the pews are.

Others realizing this situation assert that organized religion has failed. They say "We are no longer interested. We are working with other organizations." As a consequence, for many men, women and children, certain spiritual needs are not met. Our civilization becomes increasingly material. The help and stimulus which comes from familiarity with the Bible and other sacred literature is lost. Divisions increase. The power of organized religion is weakened.

Both groups say: "The ideal is coming some day. It may soon be realized. Communities and churches ought to be bound together in unity: Religion ought to bind people together in that 'sense of kinship which makes them wondrous kind.'" They say this, and then do nothing.

It has been said of Judas Iscariot that when he took the thirty pieces of silver and revealed the whereabouts of Jesus, he did not really mean to betray the Master but that his real feeling was that Jesus was so strong, had such supernatural power, that even though his enemies were led to him, he would be able to protect himself and confound them. He was the Messiah. So, some say, Judas took the money thinking that Jesus' career was safe anyhow and it was not necessary to give him active support.

Many have some such feeling in regard to the great ideals of religion. "Sometime these ideals will prevail. They cannot be defeated. Meantime we can take the easy way. We might as well accept present conditions. We have our own practical interests to care for." Thus the house remains divided and the spirit of Jesus is crucified again.

Many others to-day, however, are striving very earnestly to promote unity and effectiveness in religion and when asked how this can be done they reply: "We can do away with everything that prevents free fellowship." "Whatever hampers or starves life is evil." "Jesus came as a Redeemer simply because he opened the way for the growth of the human soul." "Every form of society, every organization that hampers full and free circulation of the friendly spirit, must disappear."

As for ourselves; if our name interferes we should give it up. "Woe unto the world because of occasions of stumbling. And woe to that man through whom the occasion cometh." "And if thine eye causeth thee to stumble, pluck it out and cast it from thee."

I love our Unitarian name. For me it means unity in freedom, fellowship in the spirit of truth. From the time of Francis David down to that of Channing and Emerson and Parker to the present day, our great leaders have striven, not to establish a sect, but to express the spirit of democracy in religion. Channing was reluctant to accept the name that separated him from others but took it in its largest meaning "and wore it as a general would a decoration," rather than give even the semblance of insincerity. Emerson and Parker strove for that dreedom and justice and truth which was the basis of the unity of our republic. Such is our tradition.

But if this name to-day limits or interferes with broader fellowship, I would drop it, not for myself, not for the individual, but for the church, leaving each individual free to call himself what he will. But call the church, as it is called, "All Souls'," and let all souls be welcome.

If denominational affiliation limited fellowship, I would say, do away with it. But in our congregational policy, it does not limit. We are free to make our fellowship here as inclusive as we wish. We may welcome, as we do, men and women of divers beliefs, into full membership. We may welcome, as we do, ministers of different faiths into our pulpit. We may welcome speakers of widely differing opinions in our forum. No limitation is imposed upon us by our denominational affiliation.

We are free to develop a fellowship of good will, of those who seek the truth and would do the right and to make this spirit spread in our community, thus helping to make religion a uniting force. We can insist "that all that is noblest in life is common." In serving the common good, in cherishing the open mind and the "understanding heart" in making our fellowship inclusive so that with us no man need be stranger, we can promote unity in religion.

And when we express this unity in practical effort, religion becomes effective. If our religion would unite us together in the practical purpose, for instance of securing a suitable playground for our community, a thing which is so much needed, it would prove itself effective. If we unite together to make it pleasanter for strangers, to make conditions easier for the overburdened, happier for those in sorrow, healthier for those in bad environment, our religion would prove itself effective.

"The teaching of Jesus" it is said, "should become practical politics." To make religion effective it should be the strength of the universal, the power of men united in good will, applied to and identified with life in the concrete. In this way all the inspiration of the past, all the inspiration of prophets and seers and of the best literature, as well as all the power of our present knowledge and ideals should be brought to bear upon our personal and social conduct and upon the issues of our day. Then would we realize the power of unity and effectiveness in religion and "out of hate and strife we would indeed create a new world where the rule would be Thy neighbor as thyself."

"For the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body."

DEBS THE DREAMER.

A dreamer? Yes, a dreamer, but
His dreams are all for you;
He dreams the dreams that nations dream,
And nations' dreams come true;
He dreams the dreams that sowers dream
When sun and rain assure
A field of silken-tasseled corn
From seed that must mature.
His ship sails on a sunlit sea—
A tide that never ebbs—
For country, home and liberty,
Come voyage on with Debs.

The Social Preparation. *Ellis B. Harris.*

CONTRIBUTED

Revolutionary Tendencies in Modern Literature

VIII.

SHELLEY.

Percy Bysshe Shelley (1792-1822) has taken his place as the greatest of all the lyrical poets of Great Britain. He was also more largely influenced by the French Revolution than any other English poet, accepted more of its ideas, and wrote more of its spirit into his poetry. In almost every respect he was a revolutionist, not only politically, but also socially, morally, religiously, and in his literary purposes. He was intimately connected with a considerable group of kindred spirits, who influenced his thought, guided his literary activities in some degree, and influenced his whole life.

Georg Brandes sees in Shelley the greatest of the English lyrical poets, and one who surpasses even Shakespeare in delicacy. Stopford Brooke finds that he comes nearer than any other poet to the fiery, swift, and yet simple form of the lyric. W. J. Courthope sees in Shelley the most brilliant representative of the romantic school of poetry. Edmund Gosse declares that Shelley outshone all his contemporaries, and is, with the exception of Shakespeare, the most fondly admired of all the poets of England. Robert Browning admires in Shelley his admirable sincerity. He credits him also with tenderness, purity of character, devotion to the right, and sympathy with all suffering.

He was eminently both tender and sincere. And not only do the same affection and yearning after the well-being of his kind, appear in the letters as in the poems, but they express themselves by the same theories and plans, however crude and unsound.

Shelley's revolutionary tendencies were shown in his youth, for he was expelled from Oxford for his atheism, he was regarded in good society as a dangerous person, his books were not read to any extent during his lifetime, and only one of them went into a second edition while he was living. His children were taken from him by the courts because of his extreme opinions, and he lived for all the later years of his life an exile from his own country because of his ideas, which he had written into his letters, his prose, and his poetry.

Shelley's life came to an end before he had reached the age of thirty, and yet his published writings bulk to a considerable extent. Had he lived to middle age or beyond we may suppose that he would have accomplished much more in the way of poetry of the first rank, with his defects and excesses largely eliminated, and his mind grown to a greater maturity. His defects are those of youth, but his mind was ripening, he was gaining greater mastery of his art, and he was maturing spiritually.

When Shelley was asked in the last year of his life why he had called himself an atheist in his Oxford essay, he replied that it was a protest against superstition, and in defiance of all injustice. By that time he had become what might be called a cosmic pantheist, and an idealist of the Platonic order. It may be doubted if he was at any time a genuine atheist, though he did refuse to accept the crude methaphysics of the church and the abstractions of the theologians. His religion was of the poetical and romantic type, thoroughly human, and largely altruistic. He had a vigorous imagination, his mind was essentially poetical, he was not able to accept what is conventional, and his thought was inventive and original. The forms and shows of life were not for him, nor were its customs and traditions such that they appealed to him. He was born to be a dissenter, a questioner, and an outlaw. He would not because he could not conform. He lived in a world of his own, not a real world indeed; but a world of fancies, imaginations, dreams, and ideals. Hence he was a poet by the very nature of his being, born to be such by all that was in his being as a man.

While to a large extent the English reacted against the revolutionary movements in France, this was by no means the case with all Englishmen. At the first that movement was received with joy and approval; but as it developed many shrank from it with doubt and then with horror. There remained, however, a goodly number who welcomed it throughout, and among these were several persons who profoundly influenced Shelley. While yet a boy he came to know the book on "Political Justice" of William Godwin, philosopher, economist, anarchist, and novelist. In that book Shelley found his political ideals and his theory of the state. In large degree he was a disciple of Godwin, to whom he looked up with great admiration. The wife of Godwin was that Mary Wollstonecraft who wrote the famous book on the "Vindication of the Rights of Woman." Their daughter became the wife of Shelley and the author of that remarkable romance, "Frankenstein." One of Shelley's most intimate friends was Byron, with whom he was closely associated during his years of residence in Switzerland and Italy. While they differed much from each other intellectually, yet they largely agreed in their revolt against the restrictions and limitations of conventional society.

In such an intellectual environment as this it cannot be a matter of astonishment that Shelley was a philosophical anarchist, that the state of his time was not to his liking, and that in politics he was an extreme radical. As a philosophical anarchist, it may be that he did not desire that the state should be abolished; but he did wish that it should be thoroughly reconstructed. He was a hater of the use of force, military power, injustice on the part of the state, and lawful disregard of human rights. He was a lover of liberty, a democrat, and one who believed in equality and fraternity to the fullest extent. Governments were to his mind in existence for the sake of the welfare of the people over whom they exercised authority; and they had no right to have any other purpose in view than the serving of those in need of their support and aid. All kinds of coercion and oppression were to him revolting, and he rebelled against all such attempts on the part of the state.

Shelley thoroughly believed in those rights of man formulated during the French Revolution, and they seemed to him the final accomplishment of human endeavor. In his early youth he set forth a set of declarations in which he embodied his political convictions. All true government, he asserted, is the result of "the moral imperishable relations of things; therefore government cannot make a law, but merely proclaims that which belongs to the foundations of morality."

"Politics," he said in another declaration, "are only sound when conducted on principles of morality. They are, in fact, the morals of nations. A government ought to be indifferent to opinions, and to have no preference whatever in regard to religion."

This is the final statement of Shelly's political creed at this time:

The only use of government is to repress the vices of men. If man were today sinless, tomorrow he would have a right to demand that government and all its evils should cease.

That man might become sinless was not a vain imagining with Shelley, for he agreed with Godwin that man is capable of perfection in the time to come. When kings disappear, autocracies are abolished, and all use of force on the part of government ceases, then will man become perfect. In the place of war, kings and priests, Shelley would substitute democracy, the utmost liberty of the individual, and the fellowship which binds men together in faithful devotion to each other.

In the year 1820 Shelley began an essay which he entitled "A Philosophical View of Reform," which was not completed at the time of his death. In the year 1920, a century later, it was first given to the public. Shelley's daughter-in-law gave the manuscript to Stopford A. Brooke, who left it to his daughter, whose husband is T. W. Rolleston, by whom it has been given to the public, with an introduction and notes. While the manuscript was left in an incomplete condition, with many gaps in its arguments, parts of its plan not being carried out, yet it gives a quite definite idea of the reforms Shelley thought ought to be brought about, and the processes by which they might be secured. What he desired was not extreme in its nature, showing that as he grew older his mind had matured, and that his demands had moderated or grown more rational.

Shelley was convinced that there was great need for reform. He was not a communist, he did not desire the abolition of property, but thought that it ought to be more evenly distributed. Tracing out the rise of modern despotisms in his first chapter, he proceeds in the second to treat of "the sentiment of the necessity for change." He claims that the monarchy and the aristocracy are hindrances to change, the upper classes making it inevitable that the workers "eat less bread, wear less clothes, are more ignorant, miserable and desperate." He found that all classes, with the exception of the privileged, were singularly unprosperous. The rulers are little better in his opinion than slave-drivers, and he held that misgovernment leads to constant misery and discontent. He maintained that the people have a right to expect and to demand conditions which will make for happiness. To his mind public happiness is the substance and the end of all political institutions. When such institutions do not secure this result, there arises the alternative between reform on the one side or military despotism on the other. The third alternative is revolution, which will attempt to overthrow what is wrong and unjust.

The situation in England in his time was summed up by Shelley in five propositions: that the people are destitute and miserable; that they are desirous of reform; that their misery results from the uneven distribution of the products of labor; that the evils from which the people suffer are caused by defects in the government; that all honorable and enlightened persons ought to assist in discovering the causes of injustice, and should aid in securing to the people the rights to which they are entitled.

The reforms proposed by Shelley seem today to be very simple and quite inadequate. As a preliminary to reform he would have the national debt abolished, the disbanding of the standing army, the abolition of sinecures and tithes, the making of all religions equal before the law, and the securing of justice in forms that are cheap, certain, and speedy. Property that is the result of exertion should be inherited; but that which results from force, fraud, and injustice should not be allowed to exist. To his mind the principal part of the property enjoyed by the aristocracy and the great fund-holders is of this latter nature.

Shelley's conclusion is that there is before the nation reform or revolution. If the masters of the nation will set their faces to the securing of the needed reforms all will be well. His demand is that suffrage shall be made universal, that changes should be brought about gradually and wisely, and that wise organization is necessary in order to secure what is desirable. There must be agitation, there must be acceptance of reforms on the part of those who are privileged, and those who are thoughtful and lovers of justice should guide the nation in the true way of reform.

If such an effort is not made, or if it proves to be unsuccessful, then are insurrection and revolution inevitable. Shelley is of the opinion that if force is made use of in order to prevent reform, then will insurrection be justifiable. The wise man will be reluctant to enter upon civil war; but this must come if there is persistent refusal to concede what the people need and what they demand. Ultimately the people will be victorious; but they should be moderate and lenient in their success. The spirit of revenge should not be insisted upon, but there should be a generous regard to the welfare of all.

Such were the reforms Shelley thought might be secured in his time, and he was convinced that they were just and right. Most of them have come about since his day, but the workers of Great Britain are only a little more contented than they were in his time. Revolution of any violent kind has not been resorted to, but the great mass of the people are still looking forward as eagerly for reform as Shelley thought in his day was justifiable. He was right in thinking that reforms come slowly, that the governing class is reluctant to concede them, and that the problem is as much now as in his day, Shall it be reform or revolution?

Shelley was a great poet, who perished in his youth. As a poet and as a thinker, he was greatly concerned in regard to human welfare. He saw the miseries of the people with a most sympathetic heart, and he desired for them all the good which it was possible for life to give. Much of that misery comes from the failures of governments, was his conviction. Therefore he would reform or revolutionize all governmental institutions, to the end that the people may be wise, free, and prosperous.

GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

Whatever we treasure for ourselves separates us from others; our possessions are our limitations.—*Rabindranath Tagore.*

The Fire Fighters

There was a city in which a tremendous fire was raging. Large sections had already been burned, and a multitude of men, women and children were shelterless. The fire was spreading rapidly and every house in the city seemed in danger. The inhabitants were making the most strenuous efforts to quench the flames. They were organized under the direction of the mayor. Their method was to hurl cans of gasoline into the burning buildings. The air was rent with explosions. The heat was so intense that brave young men were killed in great numbers as they obeyed the orders of their leaders and, nobly reckless of personal safety, fought the fire with gasoline.

The entire population appeared to have one absorbing interest, to put out the fire. Women and children worked to keep up the supply of gasoline. People whose dwellings were still a long way from the fire felt that their homes were endangered and did their utmost to help. Devotion to the common purpose was stimulated by the eloquent words of certain men who went this way and that speaking on "The Moral Aims of Throwing Gasoline at a Fire." Some of these speakers appeared to be Christian ministers and they said, "Go to it, in the name of Christ. Undoubtedly he would be with you, a gasoline can in each hand, were he on earth today." Others wore caps and gowns and were evidently college presidents and professors. They talked learnedly: "Gasoline is not chemically an ideal fire extinguisher, but in the present circumstances it is the only extinguisher available. Use it without stint or there will not be a house left in the city."

Much use was made of a stirring slogan the mayor had felicitously improvised—he had a masterly command of language—when he called on the citizens to put the fire out: "To make the city safe for domesticity."

There was a very small group of the inhabitants who seemed more or less out of sympathy with the prevailing sentiment and the general endeavor. Several of them got quite excited and rushed about shouting at the top of their voices: "For God's sake stop throwing gasoline into the flames. Gasoline is not a fire extinguisher at all. It only makes the fire worse." The police arrested these men promptly and put them in jail, although not until some of them had been roughly handled by indignant citizens.

Others of the little band of dissenters remarked bitterly: "The fire was started by men who have gasoline to sell. They have fooled the people into the notion that gasoline is a fire extinguisher!" Still others said: "The city will be destroyed. There will not be a house left. But what of it? The houses were for the most part not fit to live in. The city was very badly planned. Good riddance to it!"

The little group grew smaller and smaller. There were very few left in it after the ministers and college professors had pleaded for an absolutely united citizenship. They said with moving eloquence: "Don't you want to make our city safe for domesticity? Surely you do. You must admit that the home is the dearest spot on earth. Don't you believe in houses, in which happy families may dwell? Are you not grateful for the house you live in, if it is still standing? Don't imagine that it will escape the general destruction that is certain to come unless this terrible fire is put out. Of course, we shall put it out, whether you do your part or not. But how ashamed you will feel when through the self-sacrifice of your fellow-citizens the city is indeed made safe for domesticity, if you did not help! You will have to face a mortification as great as that of the nobleman to whom Henry IV said, 'Go hang yourself, brave Crillon; we conquered at Arques and you were not there.'"

"But," answered some of the recalcitrants, "we can not believe that gasoline will save the houses. It seems to us that it will guarantee their destruction." A famous college president, director of a society for the study of the prevention of fires, made a crushing reply: "It was entirely proper," said he, "for you to express that opinion prior to last Thursday at 9:39 p. m. But at that moment, when the city council—in the election of which you had a voice, remember—decided by a vote of 16 to 2 that gasoline is the only fire extinguisher available under present circumstances, then it became your duty as a loyal citizen to accept the lawfully reached conclusion of the constitutional authorities, and to do your part in saving the city by the method they chose. To insist on your own private judgment in a time like this, when the homes of the city are imperiled, is nothing less than treason. It is disloyalty to your own home, to the homes of the city, to the brave gasoline hurlers who have already given their lives to make the city safe for domesticity, to the Moral Order, to God."

The little group of wilful men had well nigh disappeared. "What is the use of protesting?" said one of them. "The people are simply insane in regard to gasoline as a fire extinguisher. I cannot bring them back to reason. If I antagonize them I shall lose my influence for good during all the rest of my life. I certainly believe that the city ought to be made safe for domesticity, and I am going to say so as loudly as any one else. I will not oppose those who believe in gasoline as a fire extinguisher, but I will suggest, whenever I am able to do it without jeopardizing my reputation, that while of course the gasoline is indispensable, it will be well *also* to turn a big stream of water on the flames."

June, 1918. HENRY W. PINKHAM.

INDIAN-PIPE.

In the heart of the forest arising,
Slim, ghostly, and fair,
Ethereal offspring of moisture,
Of earth and of air,
With slender stems anchored together
Where first they uncurl,
Each tipped with its exquisite lily
Of mother-of-pearl,—
Mid the pine-needles, closely enwoven
Its roots to embale,—
The Indian-pipe of the woodland,
Thrice lovely and frail!

Is this but an earth-springing fungus—
This darling of Fate
Which out of the mouldering darkness
Such light can create?
Or is it the spirit of Beauty,
Here drawn by love's lure
To give to the forest a something
Unearthy and pure;
To crystallize dewdrop and balsam
And dryad-lisped words
And starbeam and moonrise and rapture
And song of wild birds?

In Harper's Magazine. —*Florence Earle Coates.*

SELECTED

The Political Function of Religion

It is quite clear to me that at the back of these conferences* there is the conviction that genuine politics must be religious in quality, and if politics are ever considered to be not religious it is because both politics and religion are not rightly understood. In the past there have been a good many people who would have stumbled over the title of my lecture, and they would have denied that religion can possess a political function. But, in view of what has happened in the last few years, such people will be far more slow thus to speak, because the plea "Keep religion and politics apart" sounds very foolish when we notice that there have come from nearly all the pulpits of this country passionate utterances in relation to the quite political matter of the European War. And if a few years ago people gathered for religious devotions and then departed without any sharp reminder that they were partners in the State, during the war period their devotions have had a very different complexion, because politics have cut into religion like a sword. I have often heard people say that they detest the introduction of political matters into that hour which is set apart for worship; but I have not heard anybody say that in church there ought to be no reference whatever to the war. And practically all the public exercises of religion in this country during the period of the war have been strongly colored by this interest, the war and its issues, which are matters of such intense political significance. Congregations have listened to earnest sermons on the moral aspects of the war, and preachers, who hitherto may have said little or nothing about social and legalized iniquities, have not hesitated to denounce the policies and the political creed of the nation which is arranged against us in war. Preachers have also, wisely or unwisely, made appeals to the young men to set aside all individual considerations and give their service to the army in the hour of the nation's need. Very well! If it is quite proper in the name of religion to call upon men to die as citizens, why is it not proper to consider under what conditions they should live as citizens? Am I to hold up the claim of the State upon the individual, as if that claim came from God himself, and yet not to speak about the character of that State and the basis upon which it rests? Is the Church to be eloquent about the politics of calamity and silent about the politics of constructive civilization? Not only have most ministers of religion in this country voluntarily admitted this political interest during the last three years, but they have been actually asked by the Government itself to admit that interest. Since the beginning of the war I have received, as a minister of a church, quite a number of communications from Government departments. I have not yet been asked my views as to the best way to get out of the trouble! I do not know that any of the teachers of religion have been approached with that view. It is apparently assumed that both by training and habit they are not likely to be of much use in that direction! But I with others have been requested by Government departments to exert the political function of Christianity in several other little ways. For instance, I have been asked to instruct my congregation as to the patriotic way in which to use money; also as to the patriotic way of consuming food, or not consuming it. I have been requested to instruct them upon the necessity of steeling their determination to continue the struggle for liberty; and I have been requested to foster the charity which will bind up the wounds of those who have been stricken and care for the widow and the orphan. If these demands are admitted, it appears to me to be nonsense to say that the doors of the house of religion must be shut against consideration of political affairs. If religion can be the ally of the State in schemes of this kind, cannot religion also have a voice upon the moral and spiritual principles which ought to govern the State? And if religion can adjust itself, as it has done, to the economic necessities of war-time, then should not religion have something to say about the necessities which are always present, and their causes?

Further, political forces have intruded into all religious organizations so mercilessly that it has become quite evident that either religion must embrace politics or politics will throttle religion. I do not mind telling you that four years ago I scarcely had the keen interest in political principles which now possesses me. If I followed my purely personal inclination, I should devote myself to studying and preaching about other matters; but I have been simply driven to tackle moral and political principles because I have seen that the very existence of religion is threatened by a political and social life atheistically founded. If we go on inculcating personal virtue whilst remaining indifferent to public policy, then we are consenting to the gradual undermining of this very personal virtue which we count so valuable. For instance, at the present time the acts committed by men, which have staggered our faith in humanity, have not been committed by them in their private capacity, but have been committed by them in obedience to their government or in loyalty to their political system. I believe it was a Scotchman who defended a rather cruel conception of God by saying that we must remember that God did many things in his position as governor which he would scorn to do as a private person. I do not want to start a theological controversy this afternoon, although I think we shall all agree that it cannot satisfy us to imagine such a moral inconsistency in the Supreme Being. My contention is, it will not for long satisfy us to admit such a contradiction in any human being or in the conception of our social life. My hope for the world at this moment has its refuge in the belief that men are a great deal better, a great deal saner and more friendly than you might suppose, judging from the expression in national solidarities and in political institutions. I should be a prey to utter despair, if I believed that there was given to us a correct clue to human nature, or even to the existing dispositions of individual men and women, in the present behavior of European states. No! The crimes and calamities which are now offending the heavens have arisen because men have tolerated a most grievous and pernicious error—the error which assumes that the moral standard applies to individuals, but does not apply to corporations. And is it not now evident that, not only the happiness of men, but also their spiritual integrity is devastated by the movement of God-denying political and economic forces? It is in vain for the dwellers in the houses to patch their roofs against the rain, when

*Huddersfield Conferences on Reconstruction.

at the head of the valley the flood is gathering which will break its barrier and carry away both houses and inhabitants. A nation, or a world of nations, whose structure is reared without regard to the principles of social ethics, liberty, justice, and truth, creates an atmosphere in which even personal religion cannot flourish; and, in the long run, men and women find it impossible to believe in God and in goodness when they are the victims of gigantic corporate wrongs and religion has nothing to say to them except sweet words of comfort, nothing to say to them about the underlying causes of the afflictions and abuses from which they suffer. Unless states are moralized, personal morality itself is endangered; and unless politics become truly religious, religion itself must necessarily grow diseased and enfeebled. All I have said so far is just to drive home my contention that the old plea, which may still be heard in some quarters, "Keep politics and religion distinct," is a plea made by people who are blind to the existing and real situation and who are insensitive to the larger issues of God's will in this world. When you divorce religion from politics, you also divorce religion from life. It is a dead religion.

Now, when we inquire in what way religion should discharge its political function, we may be told that the church is already doing this, first of all by purifying the individual disposition and elevating the individual characters which compose the society and the nation. I cannot agree that that is sufficient. It would be a poor outlook if there was no wider and swifter channel of influence for religion than this. The purifying of the individual disposition and the elevating of the individual character scarcely touch the problem which is created when the individual has to exist in conditions which are foul, and has to play his part in a collective action which is a violent contradiction of the ideals of individual character. It is misleading to talk as if individual dispositions can be indifferent to circumstances. For instance, the individual disposition of our soldiers at this present time is immeasurably finer than the tasks which an evil-born necessity has imposed upon them. Every mother will tell you, every real mother, that Jack or Harry is a better fellow than the things which he has to do as a soldier. What they do, they do as the agents of national necessity, and we are all saying in these days that this necessity will have to be removed, so that no longer men shall find themselves obliged to act as servants of a political force which is a blank denial of the God whom they may have enthroned in their individual hearts. And I believe that all the more thoughtful soldiers would—and with good reason—turn in contempt from a religion which at this moment could merely tell them to be upright and sweet tempered and pure hearted, and had nothing definite to say about the ideals which shall shape a new world in which men shall not have such terrible duties imposed upon them. Religion which concentrates all upon the individual disposition is playing a losing game. If we preach to individuals only about personal virtue and allow them to be surrounded by a social structure which is an organized denial of moral laws and God, the sermon by which they will be most influenced is the sermon preached by the social system in which they have to live. And such a system enforces a conflict of duties which is itself a spiritual outrage. It is dangerouly insufficient to instruct men and women concerning individual virtue and the ethical claim upon them as individuals, and not at the same time to instruct them about the ethical claim upon the community; because sooner or later every honest man will desire to know what honesty means in a corporation or a community. We know what an honest man is; but does anybody know what an honest corporation is? When the honest man gets into the grip of the corporation, what about his honesty? Or what will be the result upon his faith in the universe when he finds his very soul torn by the conflict between the individual standard of honesty and that which he has to obey as a loyal servant of a corporation? Decent-minded people cannot be satisfied to be the members of a community, which in its collective action exhibits the character of a savage ape. We must have a completely social and political interpretation of ethics and religion.

Some people will say that we have already from the churches of this country and of other countries proclaimed such an interpretation. I am aware that it is often said that the church is fulfilling its office very well at present by declining to say anything about the current details of political life, or to descend to contemporary definitions, but by declaring the broad and vital principles which govern social and political life. I would remark in passing that the church has been remarkably generous in giving itself to the details of charity and palliation. What could be more detailed than the relief which religion in this country has organized, well organized, for the sake of the victims of the present social order; and what could be more definite than the political interest of the church when its own fortunes are being attacked, or its own special interests are in peril? I am a Nonconformist, and so I had better shoot on my own fields. I have seen a great Nonconformist assembly clap and cheer itself frantic on some semi-political address respecting the relation of Nonconformity to the Church of England. I have not yet heard from a Nonconformist gathering such a mighty cheer when the political matter to be discussed was the position and prospects of the poor and the disinherited. I am suspicious of this constant refusal to descend to details and to definitions, when the interests of the whole of the people are concerned. But allowing that the prime political function of religion is to set forth the great principles of social life, then I fear in this land we have not heard yet any loud and compelling proclamation of fundamental principles. Religion has given voice to large sentiments, such as brotherhood, and service, and peace. That is all to the good, but the sentiments have not been sharpened and made solid in the form of principles. We have allowed these sentiments to languish to the point of sentimentality; we have not given them the efficient power of reasoned, vital principles. There never was a greater and more urgent need for religion to proclaim the vital and immutable principles which govern social life, to explain them so that they bite, to put them forward so that they explode, to press for their embodiment in the local institution and the national policy. Mere sentiment breaks into spray upon the rocks of our existing conventions and institutions. It is not enough to talk vaguely of human brotherhood. What men want to know is this: what does justice mean upon which the sentiment of brotherhood must rest? And it is not enough to talk sweetly about peace. What men want to know is: what is the meaning of liberty upon which alone peace can rest?

I can guess how exasperating it must be for any active political worker to enter a church, and then to have to endure for half an hour a minister rather ignorantly dabbling in the stream of current politics. If that is political religion then I do not want to stock it. But I cannot imagine a nobler inspiration for an active political worker than that which would come to him when he heard a preacher of religion, a man standing as the expounder of the law of God, setting forth that moral law in its political application. In fact, whether he admits it or not, I believe the real politician has a lurking contempt for the organized religion which has nothing to say, or only feeble things to say, about the great unchanging laws which our human laws can only attempt to reflect; and I must confess, as a minister of religion, that from the beginning of the nineteenth century until now religion has usually either been wrongfully silent or sadly inept when it has come to the political application of religious truth. Abraham Lincoln refused to attend the discourses of an eminent divine in Washington, giving as his reason that he did not care to listen to the exposition of Divine law from a man who could not be trusted to construe correctly the laws of the state. I believe that the time is coming, and the moment is here now, when men and women are awakening to the fact that it is not any use listening to the descriptions of the mysteries of the Divine nature from men who can only haltingly expound a simple matter such as: how are men and women to live together decently upon this earth as children of God, and not as maddened beasts?

As we survey the tragic situation of this present time, we know that there is being forced upon us the task of social reconstruction—a reconstruction of the relations of nations and the internal relations of our nation. I believe that this reconstruction can only be well undertaken with convictions which have been raised to the power of religion. I believe that this tragic confusion would never have come upon us unless men had acquiesced in that iniquitous error—an error which has proved the most disastrous in the whole history of mankind—the belief that morality is personal but is not political. Do not let us deceive ourselves. We have not escaped that error in Great Britain. We have comprehended personal relations with ethical and religious truth, but we have certainly not yet comprehended social, industrial, and political relations with religious truth. We have focussed the moral principle so that we are able to discern more or less clearly our relations to the individuals nearest to us; but beyond that circle there is still fog and collision. Moral principle must now be focussed so that we can take in the wider and more complex social relations; and our political changes must be informed by the burning truth, which I say is nothing less than a religious truth, that the moral law cannot be broken with impunity either by an individual or a society. Theft and murder are none the less crimes because they are committed by societies or are condoned by societies; and the penalty cannot be evaded. And one thing which I would specially emphasize is this: It is not sufficient to instruct the individual in his duty towards the community, we must also instruct the community in its duty towards the individual; that is to say, we must make clear that the moral duty is not only for the individual man and woman, standing in the social group; but that moral duty is also for the social group, for nations, or a whole world of nations, and that reverence for personal values is crucial to the establishment of political righteousness. Until now our social and political life has been shaped by inadequate thought and by defective principle, and it can be nothing less than religion which now supplies the better thought and the proper ideals. I think that we want a rebirth of a genuine prophetic religion, which, fearless, flaming, could appeal to the social consciences of people, to the conscience of the nation and of humanity.

At present religion is too little in touch with social realities, and politics are too little in touch with religious ideals; and my hope is that both politics and organized religion will very soon be revivified, regenerated, by drawing closer together in a common aim—to bring a practical recognition of the government of God. I desire that politics should be re-established as our common endeavor towards the kingdom of God and towards the development of that society in which each citizen shall have the fullest opportunity to develop bodily, mentally, and spiritually; politics which will perceive that democracy is not merely a form of government, but also an entire way of life; not merely government of the people by the people for the people, but the use of all the natural resources given by God by all the faculties of man for the sake of all the people. Nothing less is democracy.

A few years ago Professor Schuster, in addressing the British Association, let fall this curious remark: "Happy were the times when it could be said with truth that the strife of politics counted as nothing before the silent majesty of the heavens"; and then to illustrate this he told the story of a very rich American, who was an astronomer and had a very powerful telescope, and who one night was visited by somebody who was a very ardent politician. It was just about the time of the presidential election in America, when the competitors for the presidency were Bryan and Taft. The politician was allowed to look through this telescope, and he gazed at the celestial wonders above and said: "You tell me that every one of them [meaning certain stars] is a sun like our own?" "Yes." "And that every one of them has its attendant planets?" "Yes." "And that they may be inhabited by life?" "Yes, that is possible." And after pondering for a few moments the politician said, rising: "Then I suppose it does not matter, after all, whether Taft or Bryan gets in!" Well, I do not appreciate the point of that story. I think that the long view leaves us more convinced that it does matter, and also that it does matter upon what issue men are elected, and moreover, that it does matter whether they are elected by ignorant and abject people or by people who are awakened to the really sacred nature of political life; and I believe that the greatness and the mystery and the majesty of the universe should heighten our sense of the importance of our task upon this earth with the confidence that the very stars in their courses fight for the advancement of liberty and the well-being of the children of men. And against a low conception of political life and duty I will put a conception which has been finely expressed by an American—Demarest Lloyd: "In the sight of the new conscience wherever man walks there is the Holy Land, and it raises the Cross of the new crusade which shall deliver the Land from the infidels who deny the divine right of the people that the will of God shall be done on earth as

THE FIELD.

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

[We submit this interesting proposal to the consideration of our readers.—Editors.]

To secure for American citizens the right to work advantageously for themselves, free from exploitation, and to solve the unemployment problem.

ARTICLE XX

Section 1. The right to work in the production or distribution of some useful or necessary commodity or social service; to participate on an equality with other citizens in the use of the best available tools and equipment for the production or distribution of some useful or necessary commodity or social service and in the election of directors of the publicly owned industry or social service in which he or she is regularly employed; and to receive the social value of labor thus performed, is hereby guaranteed to every citizen of the United States.

Section 2. The social value of labor performed in publicly owned industries or social services shall be determined upon the basis that the average daily individual output in one useful or necessary public industry or social service is equal to the value of the average daily individual output of citizens engaged in any other public owned industry or social service.

Section 3. Congress shall initiate, acquire and establish useful or necessary industries and social services; shall provide by general laws for the organization and continuance of such public industries and social services, for the exchange or disposition of commodities and social services and for the election of directors; provided, however, that the first directors of a public industry or service established under this amendment may be elected by Congress, one-half of the number of directors so elected shall serve for a period of not more than five years; after such period of not more than five years one-half of the directors of any public industry or service established under this amendment shall be elected by the citizens regularly employed therein.

Section 4. Congress shall levy taxes and appropriate funds for the purposes of this amendment.

Section 5. All provisions of the Constitution of the United States and all laws conflicting with this amendment are hereby repealed.

THE WORLD PEACE AND AMERICAN-JAPANESE CO-OPERATION.

The Japan Society of New York gave a luncheon at the Lawyers' Club on June 24th, in honor of the Japanese Parliamentary delegation now visiting this country. On that occasion, Mr. R. Nakanishi, chairman of the delegation, made a speech which is reproduced herein. Mr. Nakanishi spoke in his native language and was interpreted by Mr. Inui, who is a lecturer in the University of Southern California. The text of the speech rendered in English was as follows:

"I feel it a great honor that you have accorded us the opportunity of meeting the most representative people of this great center of the world's activities.

America was good enough to send your distinguished law-makers to our country last summer, knowing such a step would prove beneficial to all concerned on both sides of the Pacific. We have come this year in a way to repay this courtesy, as well as to get better knowledge of the social and political conditions of this great Republic.

Among the many profitable impressions we have received so far, I might point out, for instance, that your people have such a noble way of realizing the opportunities of development through the spirit of self-reliance and the institutions of orderly co-operation, all of which are valuable lessons to our people.

But your cordiality and hospitality exceeded all of the good impressions that have strewn our short but eventful journey in this country.

While it is true that there are a few radical anti-foreign expressions in both countries, I now thoroughly believe that all of the pending questions between them will be cleared away by friendly discussions between individuals and peoples. I believe that the solution lies largely in greater mutual trust, faith and understanding. I am happy to bear witness that the impressions you have given me and my associates and the atmosphere we have felt reinforce the view I have just expressed.

I have also heard that the American people are interested in the proposed Anglo-Japanese alliance. Of course it is one of the matters that is attracting much attention in Japan at the present moment. But it is because our people are interested in the maintenance of permanent peace in the Far East, and for no ulterior motives whatsoever, and in this I have perfect confidence that the Japanese Government will not disappoint you.

Through the recent war the world has learned that militarism is no longer the guarantee of peace, nor the means of furthering national interests. We have learned that it will, on the contrary, invoke eventual disasters and woeful calamities.

One of Japan's aspirations in the race in which she is engaged with progressive nations of the world is surely not in the building up of a strong armament, but rather it lies in the democratization of her domestic institutions. Already the spirit of democracy has been popularized to the extent that the people are no longer satisfied to follow blindly the dictates of a powerful few, nor a handful of military cliques.

Our delegation has no suggestion, much less instruction, from the Government. It was organized voluntarily by the members of four parties into which the House of Representatives is practically divided.

We know that a welcome awaits us for what report we shall take home, not because of our position or influence, but because of the fact that the people of Japan are so eager to learn about the world affairs, and the affairs particularly of your country.

As we were escorted yesterday through the streets of this metropolis of the world, and heard the explanation of the careers of the people represented in the wonderful Hall of Fame of the Chamber of Commerce, we become drunk with admiration for the marvelous achievements. You have been the source of influence and inspiration on this continent, but now your actions and expressions will have a great influence and bearing upon the shaping of the world's destiny.

We consider it a great honor, as well as a pleasure, if we can claim our modest share with you in the promotion of peace in the world, and especially of peace along the Pacific regions. It will indeed be a source of pride when we shall be able to point back and say we have done our part for humanity.

Again, on the behalf of the delegation, I wish to thank you most heartily for your unfailing and most cordial reception."

[Sent by Lucia Ames Mead from *East and West News Bulletin.*]

Communism and Christianism:

ANALYZED and contrasted from the Marxian and Darwinian points of view. By William Montgomery Brown, D.D. The writer, a Bishop in the Episcopal Church, smites supernaturalism in religion and capitalism in politics.

Comments: "One of the most extraordinary and annihilating books I have ever read. It will shake the country." "I call it a sermon. The text is astounding: Banish the gods from the sky and capitalism from the earth." "It came like a meteor across a dark sky and it held me tight." "Bishop Brown is the reincarnation of Thomas Paine and his book is the modern Age of Reason." "It will do a wonderful work in this the greatest crisis in all history." "A remarkable book by a remarkable man of intense interest to all."

Published in October, 1920. Fiftieth Thousand now ready, 223 pages; cloth $1.00; paper, 25c or six copies $1.00, postpaid.

THE BRADFORD-BROWN EDUCATIONAL COMPANY, Inc., *Publishers*
168 South Union Street **GALION, OHIO**

in heaven. It insists that every question between men is a religious question, a question of moral economy before it becomes one of political economy, and will make all political, industrial and social activities functions of a new church—a church of the deed as well as of the creed; a church which will not let any man offer charity to those to whom he refuses justice."

Bradford, England. —*Vivian T. Pomeroy.*

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 231
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

Subscribe for and read UNITY—
Do not miss a single number!

UNITY is a weekly paper which for forty-two years, under the editorship of Jenkin Lloyd Jones, upheld the fundamental principles of religion, political economy, and social relations; and this policy is maintained under the new editors, John Haynes Holmes and Francis Neilson. During the War UNITY was steadfast to the cause of righteousness and good will among the peoples of the earth. It has constantly dealt with the grave economic and political problems of Europe and the rest of the world in a straightforward unflinching manner, and it has from time to time published information of deep interest to its readers with which no other paper in the United States has dealt. It is non-sectarian. It advocates free religion and equal opportunity, as the means of uniting all peoples in the bonds of fellowship and amity. UNITY seeks to direct the minds of its readers to all that is best in the world of thought as expressed in the literature of the day, and its literary reviews are not the least valuable part of the several departments which its staff conducts from week to week. There are men and women of international renown writing for its columns and its subscribers are to be found in all the important countries of the world.

If these principles appeal to you, will you not subscribe and interest your friends?

- - - -